Graham Greene on Laos, P. 2

Second (And More Hopeful) Thoughts on McCloy as Kennedy's Arms Negotiator, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 2 JANUARY 16, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Our Air of Injured Innocence Over Cuba

On one plane of our national consciousness, it is assumed with approval that our government is doing all in its power short of war to overthrow the Castro government in Cuba. On another and separate plane, we take it as an affront when the Cuban regime accuses us of aggressive intent. Like the respectable *bourgeois* in a French farce who has a mistress stashed away in another part of town, we manage at one and the same time to enjoy illicit pleasure and righteous indignation. The average American reads with satisfaction in our daily press and weekly picture magazines of the Cubans being trained on our soil and in a growing number of Central American hideouts for an invasion of Cuba. The Sunday supplements treat the CIA and its operatives like a real life comic strip adventure story; we get a vicarious satisfaction from its cloak-and-dagger exploits; we marvel at the broad hints of its adeptness in setting conflagrations, getting rid of dangerous characters in governments we do not like, and buying up men of the lesser breeds on our borders. But let the Castro regime complain of such activities and we at once take the complaint as further evidence of its unregenerate character and perverse unfriendliness.

Would We Wait for Affidavits?

It is true that the Castro government often gets its facts mixed up, like a suspicious wife who nags about the one night when the errant husband really was sitting up with a sick friend. But we in our turn act like the seasoned reprobate who seizes on any minor error of accusation to work up a fine protective lather of injured innocence. When Castro after a growing number of terrorist incidents, including the bombing of a department store in Havana, accused the U.S. Embassy of acting as director and paymaster for such activities, and demanded that we cut its staff to 11 men, he may have been foolish to take a step which invited a break in relations and he may have been wrong in some of his accusations. But why the sudden pretense on our part that CIA operatives only spend their time translating *Pravda?* If terrorism broke out in our country after the Cuban press had been boasting of a secret agency for such activities, would we wait for affidavits before taking action to stop it?

Those more thoughtful Americans who can manage to get the transcript of the Security Council debate earlier this month on the Cuban charge of imminent aggression will blush to see this process in full operation. The Cuban government was silly and overwrought in accusing the U.S. of being "about to perpetrate within a few hours direct military aggression" and it was clumsy and reckless in placing so much reliance on a wild Uruguayan newspaper report that we had circulated a document to all Latin American foreign ministries declaring that we would intervene militarily to prevent the installation in Cuba of 17—no less—Soviet rocket sites. This gave Mr. Wadsworth a chance to term Mr. Roa's charges "empty, groundless, false, fraudulent". But much of Mr. Roa's indictment was based on material published in our own press about the way U.S. government agencies and big businesses have been helping to train Cubans and American adventurers for infiltration and invasion of Cuba. Mr. Wadsworth dismissed all this as "a welter of photographs" and newspaper clippings. Such activities are in plain violation of international law and of our neutrality statutes. It is not true that in this regard and in regard to swiftly built new air bases in Guatemala (see box on this page) "the United States" as Mr. Wadsworth indignantly exclaimed "has nothing to hide." Much *is* hidden. It is significant that Mr. Wadsworth entered no specific denials to any item in Mr. Roa's complaint except the Soviet rocket base story. To deny other items would have been to challenge half a dozen reputable U.S. publications. Many of them, moreover, were not *exposing* but patriotically boasting of these activities.

The charge by Mr. Roa which most called for rebuttal,

(Continued on Page Four)

Nothing to Hide?

"The United States has nothing to hide."

—Mr. Wadsworth at the Security Council Jan. 4 answering Cuban charges.

"Near Guatemala's Pacific Coast, 35 miles from the Mexican border, lies a new solidly paved, closely guarded airstrip. . . . Could it be the base for a cooperative U.S.-Guatemalan-Cuban exile airborne military operation against Fidel Castro? Los Angeles Mirror Aviation Editor Don Dwiggins heard about the strip and broke a story reporting it had been built with U.S. funds in a mysterious 'crash' program. . . . On the subject of U.S. participation, no official in Washington had a word to say." *—Time Magazine, Jan. 6.*

"Each week a plane leaves Miami International Airport with 50 to 60 young Cubans bound from local staging areas for one of three secret training camps. . . . As a part of the same operation, veteran fighter pilots, recruited from among defectors from Castro's own air force and from Latin American countries, are training at what was once a dilapidated airstrip in Guatemala." *—New York Daily News, Jan. 9.*

"U.S. Helps to Train Anti-Castro Forces
At Secret Guatemalan Air-Ground Base"

—Page 1, headline, New York Times, Jan. 10.

"A State Dept. official specializing in Latin American affairs turned aside all questions about the Guatemalan base with: Don't ask us about it, ask the spooks—the Central Intelligence Agency."

—New York Post, Jan. 10.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But So Far Only Freshman Congressman Fitzhugh Ryan of New York Has Come to His Support

Roosevelt Wins Right to be Heard on Budget of the Un-Americans

Congressman James Roosevelt's campaign to challenge the appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee this year has made a little headway since our last issue. Omar Burleson (D. Tex.), chairman of the House Administration Committee, which passes on the budgets of all House committees, wrote Mr. Roosevelt that while his committee does not hold public hearings it would be "perfectly proper for you or any other Member of Congress" to testify on the Un-American Activities appropriation request when it comes before the Administration Committee. Mr. Burleson promised to advise him in advance and added that when the bill is brought to the floor of the House he would be glad to yield "for whatever statement you may wish to make" before the vote is taken. On the other hand Mr. Burleson said he saw "no justification for outside individuals or representatives of organized groups" to appear. This would be the first time in the Un-American Activities Committee's history that its budget was challenged.

Walter Accepts Challenge

In the meantime Congressman Walter told Jack Steele of Scripps-Howard (New York World-Telegram Jan. 4) that while it was not customary for the Administration Committee to hold public hearings, he would welcome an opportunity to debate the accomplishments of the Un-American Activities Committee with Roosevelt at a public hearing.

So far only one other member of the House, a freshman Congressman from New York City, Fitzhugh Ryan, has come forward to support Mr. Roosevelt's campaign. Mr. Ryan (Princeton and Columbia Law School) is a lawyer who was for seven years an Assistant District Attorney in Manhattan. He is the first anti-Tammany Democrat to be elected from New York City. He defeated Ludwig Teller in the primaries last year and represents the 20th District, the West Side from 20th to 110th Street. Mr. Ryan campaigned among other things for abolition of the Un-American Committee, and for a re-evaluation of U.S. China policy.

In an extension of remarks in the Congressional Record Jan. 6, Mr. Ryan said of the HUAC appropriation, "It's a major leak that needs immediate repair. Hundreds of thousands of dollars annually are not only being wasted but are actually being used to humiliate scores of loyal American citizens and to embarrass thousands of others."

On the New Frontier in the Senate

We hope readers have noticed the charming tableau in the Senate where the militant New Frontiersmen are grouped around Richard Nixon in their struggle to keep Democratic platform pledges and eliminate the filibuster. Mr. Nixon, whose liberalism was overlooked in the recent contest, has become their indispensable man because as presiding officer he continues to rule that the Senate has a right to change its rules by majority vote at the beginning of each session. The strategy of the leadership seems to be to postpone a vote until Johnson can take over as Vice President. The New Frontier in the Senate looks strikingly like the same old back alley.

Behind the scenes, where the committees operate, the story is the same. Senator Joseph S. Clark (D. Pa.) was defeated in the Democratic Steering Committee 9 to 7 in his battle to unseat Byrd and Eastland as chairman respectively of Finance and Judiciary, and to liberalize both committee by enlarging them. Instead Judiciary, the key to civil rights, was made worse by replacing two late liberals, O'Mahoney and Hennings, with two conservatives, Blakely of Texas and Long of Missouri. The vacancy on Finance went to Fulbright. Clark was denied a seat on Foreign Relations where two vacancies were filled by Symington and Eastland's side-kick Dodd of Connecticut. Though Clark has two years seniority over him, Dodd was promised the post for supporting Johnson's candidacy last year.

As for young Kennedy, he's beginning to look, from the perspective of the rules fight, more and more like that other New Englander, Silent Cal Coolidge.

Graham Greene, Author of The Quiet American, Bitter About U.S. Policy in Laos

"They are not worth much, the buildings of Vientiane, and the people who inhabit that shabby administrative centre had little to live for and less to die for. One hopes that Luang Prabang will have a better fate. This is one of the most beautiful towns in the world, with a royal palace the size of a very small country house, and almost every four buildings a temple—in one of them the footmark of Buddha: a town of bells and peace.

"One cannot believe, now that the French are gone, that the people of Laos are much concerned with either of the warring parties: there is not the fervent common enthusiasm, which made the war in Vietnam a national war, and it is tragic to think that a western power has brought war back. Wasn't Dien Bien Phu a sufficient lesson?

"The dream of a neutral Laos was a good one, but it is idle to think that neutrality can fail to have a certain colouring when the neutral country lies on the borders of two conflicting systems. Would Sweden be more secure if Finland were maintained by American arms and money as a neutral state with a western tinge? If full-scale war develops in Laos we shall have a heavy load on our conscience, even though the load may have been imposed by an ally and not by our own Government.

"For four winters in Vietnam I was an unhappy witness of the disintegration caused by the intrigues of American undercover agencies in the cause of an unrealizable dream—the dream of a Third Force; nobody with any knowledge of Laos is likely to deny that Prince Souvanna's Government had been undermined by the aid given from the U.S. to right wing forces. At least the Russian aid at the beginning of this mad competition was given to the legal government of the country.

"One is painfully reminded of the Spanish Civil War. America has taken on the role played then by Germany and Italy, and they are American weapons which have helped to destroy Vientiane; one can only hope that England will not play again her former pusillanimous part by aiding, with her ambiguous diplomacy, the forces of the right.

"Can any sane person believe that a right wing government would ever be allowed to exist, contrary to the agreement of Geneva, on the borders of China and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, any more than Guatemala was allowed to keep a government under communist influence?"

—Graham Greene, writing to The London Times, Jan. 4.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second Thoughts on John J. McCloy's Appointment as Kennedy's Arms Negotiator

Open Mind on Disarmament Shown in 1952 Lectures and 1956 Preface

We want to express some second thoughts on the subject of the appointment of John J. McCloy as President-elect Kennedy's principal disarmament negotiator. We dismissed him in a sentence last week as able and likeable but a Chase Manhattan Bank man, who helped prepare the way for German rearmament as U.S. High Commissioner in the Reich.

Our second thoughts derive from two sources. One is an attempt while dashing about the Capitol on various journalistic errands to think through the political realities. Though there is disquiet everywhere about the arms race, disarmament is not popular either in the country or in Congress. It is hard to visualize a two-thirds vote in the Senate at the moment either for a nuclear treaty or for more general disarmament. Only a man who has behind him the weight of substantial moneyed and conservative associations can possibly win approval for either type of treaty.

What of His Chase Bank Post?

But one may ask, how can one expect disarmament from the retired head of Chase Manhattan, the bank of the Rockefeller family and Standard Oil, and from a man with links of friendship as close as Mr. McCloy's with Chancellor Adenauer of Germany. These names hardly connote a readiness for relaxation of tension and disarmament.

Indeed they do not. But it is precisely such forces which must be persuaded if disarmament is to be achieved. The Soviets, judging from the latest Pugwash discussions and Khrushchov's speeches, are determined to have a go at talking with us about total disarmament. Total disarmament is far more revolutionary than communism. The institution of war is far older than that of private property. To give up national armaments is to accept the beginnings of a system of world law and of a world police force, and the end of imperialism in all forms, whether capitalist or communist.

If the Russians are serious about this, they must make it palatable to the great capitalist interests of the West. It cannot be negotiated with stray intellectuals or pacifists. The masters of money, the major families and financial institutions, must be convinced. For such purposes, there must be negotiation with just such men as McCloy. It is no good saying (as I did last week) that there is little passion for disarmament visible in his past record. For this is true of most men. It is only from a growing common realization of a common danger that the human race may be persuaded slowly to move back from the abyss.

The other source of my second thoughts was a most informative portrait of Mr. McCloy in the *New York Post* Jan. 9 by Theodore Kaghan, one of its editors and once chief of information in McCloy's administration in Germany. This portrait called my attention to two books I have since read. One of them is Mr. McCloy's *"The Challenge to American Foreign Policy"*, the Godkin lectures he delivered at Harvard early in 1953. The second is Mr. McCloy's preface to a book *"Russia and America"* by Henry L. Roberts, published in 1956.

There is much in both with which, of course, I do not agree. But both bear the marks of an enlightened mind with whom negotiation should be possible. The spirit they express is not that of a John Foster Dulles. We recommend them to thoughtful readers. In the Godkin lectures, early in 1953, McCarthy's heyday, one will find Mr. McCloy had the courage to register a quiet dissent from the witch hunt (see pages 18-19 and 80) and to say even then, "We should not rule out the possibility of discussing at an appropriate—though it now seems far distant—time a total disarmament scheme such as Grenville Clark proposes" a reference to the plan later fully blueprinted in *"World Peace Through World Law"* by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn (Harvard University Press, 1958).

In the preface to *"Russia and America"* one will find along with familiar cold war stereotypes and a seemingly too ready acceptance of German nuclear rearmament many positive ideas: a plea that Germany accept her present eastern borders to make possible reconciliation with Poles and Czechs, a warning against "the tendency to attribute all political and economic developments in this unsettled world to Soviet deviltry and cunning", an acceptance of neutralism "as the depolarization of power continues" between U.S. and U.S.S.R., advocacy of cultural intercourse between East and West and above all these words which give hope—

"Sooner or later some alternative to the race for armaments will have to be found. U.S. policy planning should devote utmost energy to devising such a break-through . . . breaking the atomic deadlock ought to be a major policy objective. . . . In my view, we must be ready to consider the most far-reaching proposals, including those for total disarmament—universal, enforceable and complete with international control and inspection. Although in the past such plans for peace through disarmament have seemed to some unrealistic and unobtainable, our present perspective encourages serious study of these and related proposals."

Their Hunger Our Opportunity

If the Chinese Communists denied that they were suffering from famine, the State Department would no doubt accuse them of covering up. Since the Chinese admit their food difficulties, the State Department insists they must be exaggerating. An item we saw in the London Telegraph (Dec. 30) seemed a graphic testimonial to the reality of China's distress. It was from Hongkong. It said a French resident of Peking just returned to Hongkong declared the food shortage even in the capital, the showplace of Chinese Communism, was so severe that it reminded him of the last days of the German occupation in Paris. "People automatically join any queue they see," he told the Telegraph, "hoping there will be some food at the ends of it." More than half the nation's cropland was damaged by drought, flood and pests in 1960, the worst year in this century for China's farmers. The same Conservative daily carried a letter from a Tory MP in its issue of Jan. 3 pointing out that the meaning of the crop failures can only be appreciated against the background of China's endemic misery. A 1950 United Nations report showed that China had the world's lowest per capita income, less than half that of India. China under Communism is an awakening giant. This famine may be our last chance to win the good-will of her people. We want to add our voice to the rising chorus of those who ask whether it is not possible in some way to leap the barriers of hatred and make a share of our food surpluses available.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Attack on Castro Would Invite Hemispheric Civil War

(Continued from Page One)

because most pregnant with future trouble, was his charge that men trained in the camps of Miami, Orlando, Homestead, Fort Lauderdale and Fort Myers, Fla., were being moved in U.S. planes to Swan Island in the Caribbean and then in groups of 150 to Guantanamo. This was not supported by U.S. press clippings but it was evident from Mr. Roa's speech that the Cubans have an extensive intelligence service, and it is dangerous if they really believe—true or untrue—that Guantanamo is being used for such a purpose. This could spark off war, and there may be forces, Cuban or American, which would like Castro to believe this in order to provoke trouble. We think more responsible U.S. agencies should make sure that this is not true, or if true that the practice of so using Guantanamo is ended, and that assurances to this effect are given the Cuban government.

No Little Errand for the Marines

We are moving toward something far more fateful than a minor colonial police operation in our relations with Cuba. It is indicative of a kind of giddy arrogance that the very day Mr. Wadsworth on Jan. 4 was assuring the Security Council that our intentions were pure as driven snow, correspondents were being given a background not-for-attribution briefing on our plans to choke off the Castro regime with a sea and air blockade. This was the common source of all those stories in the papers of Jan. 5 on our plans to "isolate" Castro, and our hope for such a blockade also explains our sudden action on Jan. 4 in voting limited economic sanctions at the OAS against the Dominican Republic, a move Castro could not avoid supporting but which is intended to win Venezuela's vote later for similar sanctions against Cuba. To blockade Cuba would be to risk international complications and a hemispheric chain reaction. The countries which stand with us in breaking relations and which might support stronger action are provocative symbols of all the Latin American masses hate. Five of the six represent the remaining dictatorships in the hemisphere: the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Paraguay. The sixth, our most recent acquisition as an ally against Castro is Peru, a country ruled by a small oligarchy. Except for El Salvador, nowhere in Latin America is there a deeper gulf between haves and have-nots than in Peru. We couldn't have less attractive recruits than these six for a crusade against a popular hero like Castro.

This is a made-to-order recipe for a hemispheric civil war. We see Castro as a pawn in our global struggle with the U.S.S.R. The Latin American masses see him as their first honest champion since the Mexican revolution and a man who dared defy U.S. oil and sugar firms. The Latins couldn't care less about our cold war. To drift into open aggression against Cuba is to run the risk of tearing the hemisphere apart. The road to the restoration of hemispheric solidarity runs through Havana. The sooner we restore good relations with Castro the sooner we can channel the volcanic forces of Latin American resentment into orderly and peaceful change. A new President provides a chance for a fresh start.

Scandalous If True

If the testimony of Dr. Charles A. Santos-Buch to the Senate Internal Security Committee Jan. 10 was true, it sounded the death knell for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It could hardly survive proof that the full page ad in the New York Times with which it started its activities last April was largely paid by Cuban government funds secretly made available by Raoul Roa, Jr., son of Cuba's Foreign Minister and a member of its delegation to the U.N. If that is true, then Robert Taber, former CBS newsman and a founder of the Committee, perjured himself when he assured the Senate Internal Security Committee last May that none of the funds had come from any foreign government. We find it hard to believe that Mr. Taber and Mr. Roa would be so irresponsible and foolish. Mr. Taber in a statement to CBS News from Havana, where he is working on a book, declared the story a fabrication. We suspend judgment until Mr. Taber and Mr. Roa have told their side of the story. Dr. Santos-Buch seemed a reluctant witness and under pressure. Since by his own account he as a Cuban resident here wanted to avoid any link with the Fair Play Committee, why did he take $3500 from Mr. Roa in cash and then put it in his own bank account, paying over the money to the Times later with a certified check? This seems a strange way to cover one's tracks.

We Deeply Appreciate This Year's Record Breaking Flood of Holiday Gift Subscriptions

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

1/16/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; 6 in Canada: $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED